

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Raman K. Rao, et al.
U.S. Patent No.: 9,019,946 Attorney Docket No.: 39843-0126IP1
Issue Date: April 28, 2015
Appl. Serial No.: 14/480,584
Filing Date: September 8, 2014
Title: WIRELESS AND CELLULAR VOICE AND DATA TRANSMISSION WITH MULTIPLE PATHS OF COMMUNICATION

SECOND DECLARATION OF DR. MICHAEL ALLEN JENSEN

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.

I further declare that these statements are made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code).

By: Michael A. Jensen

Michael Allen Jensen, Ph.D.
September 1, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	YEGOSHIN-JOHNSTON-BILLSTRÖM RENDERS OBVIOUS MULTIPLE IP ADDRESSES (CLAIMS 14-16)	4
	A. A POSITA WOULD HAVE FOUND IT OBVIOUS TO MODIFY YEGOSHIN'S PHONE BASED ON BILLSTRÖM'S USE OF IP ADDRESS FOR IP-BASED CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS	4
	B. MODIFICATION OF YEGOSHIN BASED ON BILLSTRÖM'S GENERAL TEACHINGS OF IP-BASED CELLULAR COMMUNICATION WOULD HAVE BEEN WITHIN A POSITA'S CAPABILITIES	9
II.	YEGOSHIN-BASED COMBINATIONS RENDER OBVIOUS SIMULTANEOUS USE OF MULTIPLE NETWORK PATHS (CLAIMS 14-21 AND 26) 11	
	A. THE CLAIMS REQUIRE SIMULTANEOUS USE, NOT SIMULTANEOUS DATA TRANSFER 12	
	B. PATENT OWNER'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN "NETWORK" VERSUS "COMMUNICATION" PATH IS ARBITRARY AND UNSUPPORTED	14
	C. WHEN A DEVICE HAS MULTIPLE, INDEPENDENT NETWORK PATHS, IT IS OBVIOUS TO USE THEM SIMULTANEOUSLY	17
III.	YEGOSHIN-JOHNSTON-BILLSTRÖM-BERNARD-PREISS RENDERS OBVIOUS TWO "NETWORK PATHS" TO THE SAME "REMOTE SERVER" "IN RESPONSE TO A CHANGE IN THE SIGNAL STRENGTH AND/OR CONNECTIVITY" (CLAIMS 27-30)	21
	A. YEGOSHIN DISCLOSES OR RENDERS OBVIOUS "REMOTE SERVER"	21
	B. PATENT OWNER'S UNDERSTANDING OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSED COMBINATION IS INCORRECT	23
	C. YEGOSHIN AND BERNARD RENDER OBVIOUS "IN RESPONSE TO A CHANGE IN THE SIGNAL STRENGTH AND/OR CONNECTIVITY"	23
IV.	YEGOSHIN-BERNARD COMBINATION RENDERS OBVIOUS "COMBIN[ING] THE DATA PATHS INTO A SINGLE TRANSMISSION INTERFACE TO ONE OR MORE APPLICATIONS" (CLAIMS 6-10, 17-21, AND 26) 25	
V.	YEGOSHIN-BASED COMBINATIONS RENDER OBVIOUS THE "MULTIPLEXED" LIMITATIONS (CLAIMS 1-13)	31

A.	THE '946 PATENT REQUIRES NO MORE THAN A KNOWN USE OF THE TERM "MULTIPLEXED/MULTIPLEXES" (CLAIM 1-4)	31
1.	The Petition Clarified The Term "Multiplex"	31
2.	Parties' District Court Claim Constructions Are Irrelevant	33
3.	Intrinsic Record Supports General Understanding of "Multiplex"	34
B.	YEGOSHIN, ALONE OR AS MODIFIED, RENDERS THE "MULTIPLEXED" LIMITATIONS OBVIOUS	40
1.	Yegoshin Teaches Both Simultaneous and Selective Connections of Cellular and WLAN Calls	40
2.	Yegoshin-Bernard Based Combination Renders Obvious "Multiplexed Signals"	42
3.	Patent Owner's Cherry-Picking Arguments Do Not Impact Petitioner's Prior Art Analysis	47
4.	Sufficient Motivations Existed To Modify Yegoshin-Johnston-Billström Based on Bernard To Satisfy The "Multiplex" Limitations	51
VI.	GROUND 1B RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 2, 5, AND 10	54
A.	CLAIMS 2 AND 5	54
B.	CLAIM 10	54
VII.	ADDITIONAL MATERIALS CONSIDERED	57
VIII.	CONCLUSION	59

1. This Declaration clarifies the conclusions that I have formed based on the analysis provided in my first declaration (EX-1003, incorporated herein by reference in its entirety; “Original Declaration”) and supplemental declaration (EX-1050, incorporated herein by reference in its entirety; “Supplemental Declaration”). Consistent with my findings provided in my Original Declaration and Supplemental Declaration and based upon my knowledge and experience and my review of the prior art publications listed in the earlier and this declarations, a POSITA would have found that claims 1-21 and 26-30 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’946 patent are rendered obvious by at least the combinations of references set forth in my Original and Supplemental Declarations.

I. YEGOSHIN-JOHNSTON-BILLSTRÖM RENDERS OBVIOUS MULTIPLE IP ADDRESSES (CLAIMS 14-16)

A. A POSITA Would Have Found It Obvious to Modify Yegoshin’s Phone Based On Billström’s Use of IP Address for IP-Based Cellular Communications

2. In Patent Owner’s Response (POR), Patent Owner does not dispute that Yegoshin and Billström describe using IP addresses for communication on WLAN and cellular networks, respectively. However, Patent Owner asserts that the combination fails to address how “Yegoshin’s phone decides and enforces which IP address to use to route each data packet.” POR, 39. This argument adds requirements into the actually claimed features (14[i]). Notably, claim 14 does not necessitate how to “select between a first IP address or a second IP address,” but

recites that “the mobile device maintains multiple IP addresses, wherein the first wireless unit is accessible on a first IP address and the second wireless transmit and receive unit is accessible on a second IP address.” EX-1001, 13:35-38; POR, 39 (citing EX-2019, ¶114).

3. Even if it is assumed that selection is required, the selection would be simple and straightforward—use the first IP address when communicating over the cellular network and use the second IP address when communicating over the WLAN. As noted in my Original Declaration, using different IP addresses for different networks was well-known before the Critical Date. EX-1016, 6:42-56, 9:6-10; EX-1003, ¶85.

4. Although Billström describes that its phone can switch between “regular GSM idle mode,” “call-connected mode,” and “PD [packet data] mode,” Billström’s switching between the modes doesn’t negate Petitioner’s proposed combination of Yegoshin and Billström. EX-1006, 6:11-21, 8:47-54, 9:19-32, Figure 4; POR, 39-41. At a minimum, in the Yegoshin-Billström combination, a POSITA would have understood and found obvious that Yegoshin’s phone would access its “second communication interface” (“*second wireless unit*”) using an IP address (“*second IP address*”) for forwarding a call to WLAN in the way Yegoshin describes. EX-1004, 6:15-22, 7:15-19, 8:8-15. Meanwhile (e.g., while using WLAN

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.